

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in an attempt to further the prosecution of the above-referenced case and in support of the attached request for continuing examination. In the present Amendment, Claims 1, 6-9, 14-17 and 22-24 are cancelled, and Claims 2-5, 10-13 and 18-21 are amended. Claims 2-5, 10-13 and 18-21 are now pending.

Objection to Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because they do not include a label referenced in the specification, label 500. The Examiner has also objected to the drawings because they include label 502, which is not mentioned in the specification. Applicant has amended the specification to replace references to label 500 with references to label 502. Applicant has made the changes in the Substitute Specification and Applicant apologizes for the failure to include these changes to the previously submitted Amendment filed on December 22, 2003. Applicant would also like to thank the Examiner for his patience.

Objection to Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification because the spacing of lines of the specification is such as to make reading an entry of amendments difficult. A substitute specification with double-spaced lines is provided herewith.

Additionally, the Examiner has objected to the specification because of the use of the word 'blank' at lines 24 and 26 of page 17. Applicant has amended the specification to replace the term 'blank' with the term 'input-box'. Applicant has made the changes in the Substitute Specification and Applicant apologizes for the failure to include these changes to the previously submitted Amendment filed on December 22, 2003. Applicant would also like to thank the Examiner for his patience.

In the substitute specification previously submitted by Applicant, typographical errors existed, which caused the substitute specification to deviate from the original specification

provided at filing. The substitute specification provided herein rectifies those typographical errors to conform the substitute specification to that which was originally filed. Applicant apologizes for any inconveniences caused to the Examiner by this oversight.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

At paragraph 10 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-24 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,496 to Li *et al.* (*Li*). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, insofar as they might be applied to the amended Claims 2-5, 10-13 and 18-21, and submit that the amended claims are not anticipated by *Li*. Applicants respectfully submit that *Li* does not disclose all elements of Applicants' invention as recited in amended Claim 1. Because anticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed invention as well as disclosing structure which is capable of performing the recited functional limitations, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. *RCA Corp v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc.*, 730 F.2d 1440, 221 U.S.P.Q. 385 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *W.L. Gore and Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

As recited in Applicants' amended claims, Applicants' invention discloses specific elements, recited in Applicants' exemplary Claim 4, which *Li* does not explicitly or inherently disclose. Foremost among these, Applicants' amended Claim 4 recites "the browser client, responsive to discovering at least one keyword within the page, incorporating the at least one keyword into a keyword field of the entry in the hotlist of pages, wherein the step of incorporating the at least one keyword into a keyword field of the entry in the hotlist of pages further comprises allowing the user to edit the keyword field of the entry in the hotlist of pages". The Examiner cites Col. 14, lines 35-37, as disclosing the editing step. The cited text of *Li* fails to disclose "allowing the user to edit the keyword field of the entry in the hotlist of pages". Instead, the cited text section discloses control over display parameters when it states:

PowerBookmarks allows personalization. FIG. 19 shows preference setup window 1900 for a user to define personal preferences. Preference setup window 1900 allows two types of preferences--display preference and bookmark preference--to be specified.

Display preference parameters allow a user to customize the metadata records shown in the query results or the navigation pages. For example, PowerBookmarks shows different sets of metadata in pages 1401 and 1402 of FIG. 14 described above. When a display preference parameter is specified, the query interface automatically augments the list of fields to project in the SELECT clause to be submitted to WebDB. For example, for displaying page 1401, the SELECT clause is "SELECT Doc.title,

Doc.access_frequency, Doc.last_refreshed_date", while for page 1402, the SELECT clause is "SELECT Doc.title, Doc.URL". (*Li*, Col. 14, lines 30-45)

It is worthy of note that the text does not discuss editing keyword content, but instead focuses on editing display preferences. Because the cited reference does not disclose Applicants' claimed feature of "allowing the user to edit the keyword field of the entry in the hotlist of pages", Applicants respectfully submit that *Li* does not anticipate Applicants' invention as recited in amended Claim 4.

Similarly, Applicants' amended Claim 5 recites "allowing the user to selectively enable automatic updates of the keyword field of an entry in the hotlist of pages whenever the page represented by the entry is accessed." The Examiner cites Col. 5, lines 56-59, as disclosing the updating step. The cited text of *Li* fails to disclose "allowing the user to selectively enable automatic updates of the keyword field of an entry in the hotlist of pages whenever the page represented by the entry is accessed". Instead, the cited text section discloses multi-variable refresh solution when it discloses:

The "refresh frequency" field allows a user to set the *frequency (e.g., in days)* at which the information about a specific document bookmark is refreshed in the database. A refresh is performed by invoking an incremental loader at specified time intervals.. (*Li*, Col. 5, lines 56-61, *emphasis added*)

The text does not discuss "automatic updates of the keyword field of an entry in the hotlist of pages whenever the page represented by the entry is accessed.", but instead discusses the performance of an action based on a measure of time. Because the cited reference does not disclose Applicants' claimed feature of "allowing the user to selectively enable automatic updates of the keyword field of an entry in the hotlist of pages whenever the page represented by the entry is accessed", Applicants respectfully submit that *Li* does not anticipate Applicants' invention as recited in amended Claim 5.

Additionally, Applicants' amended Claim 3 recites "the browser client automatically generating a group of keywords based on the content of the page responsive to discovering an absence of keywords within metadata for the page". The Examiner cites Col. 5, lines 47-50, as disclosing the generating step. The cited text of *Li* fails to disclose "the browser client automatically generating a group of keywords based on the content of the page responsive to

discovering an absence of keywords within metadata for the page". Instead, the cited text section discloses search engine technology with a full-text search when it discloses:

Specifically, in this embodiment, field "FullText_Contents is the index identifier returned by JTOPIC full text search engine 109 when a document is indexed in JTOPIC. When a user issues a query for a full text search, JTOPIC returns a set of index identifiers for the documents matching the query criteria. (*Li*, Col. 5, lines 46-51)

The text does not discuss "the browser client automatically generating a group of keywords based on the content of the page responsive to discovering an absence of keywords within metadata for the page" or any other keyword-based operation, but instead discusses the use of a full-text search engine. Because the cited reference does not disclose Applicants' claimed feature of "the browser client automatically generating a group of keywords based on the content of the page responsive to discovering an absence of keywords within metadata for the page", Applicants respectfully submit that *Li* does not anticipate Applicants' invention as recited in amended Claim 3.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully that all pending Claims are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian F. Russell

Brian F. Russell
Registration No. 40,796
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS